

R E M A R K S

This Amendment is responsive to the Office Action mailed November 6, 1995, in which claims 4-41 were rejected, and claims 1-3 and 5-40 were allowed. With this response, claim 4 has been amended, and claim 41 has been cancelled. Claims 1-40 remain in the application.

With this response, Applicant has revised drawing figures 2A and 2B to correct the location of sample holder 54. Applicant has submitted with this amendment proposed drawing corrections. This proposal includes an enclosed separate letter to the draftsman in accordance with MPEP 608.02(r); and a print or pen and ink sketch showing changes in red ink in accordance with MPEP 608.02(v). Approval of these drawing corrections is requested.

The Examiner objected to the specification stating that it failed to provide a brief description of drawing Figures 2A-2C. The Examiner further stated that reference to Figures 2A, 2B and 2C is needed somewhere within the description. In response, Applicant has amended the specification as indicated above. With these amendments, Applicant believes the Examiner's above objections to the specification has been overcome and should be withdrawn.

The Examiner rejected claim 4 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Specifically, the Examiner rejected claim 4 stating, "The phrase 'said sensor' lacks antecedent basis". Applicant corrected this antecedent basis problem in Applicant's

previous response to Paper No. 5.

At page 4, the Examiner further stated, "Claim 4 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112 and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims". Applicant has amended claim 4, by including the limitations of claim 1, and by putting it into independent form. With this Amendment, Applicant now believes that the above rejections to claim 4 have been overcome and should be withdrawn.

The Examiner rejected claim 41 under 35 U.S.C. §103 citing various references. Applicant has cancelled claim 41 without prejudice from this application.

In light of the above response, Applicant believes claims 1-40 to be in allowable form. Accordingly, reconsideration of the above rejections and the issuance of a notice of allowance is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Wayne A. Bonin

By his attorney,

Dated: January 5, 1996

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service on the date shown below with sufficient postage in first class mail in an envelope addressed to the:

United States Patent and Trademark Office

on the 5 day of January, 1996  
NAWRONSKI, ROONEY & SIVERTSON P.A.

By: Steven E. Dicke

Steven E. Dicke

Steven E. Dicke

Reg. No. 38,431

NAWRONSKI, ROONEY & SIVERTSON, P.A.

Suite 401, Broadway Place East

3433 Broadway Street Northeast

Minneapolis, MN 55413

Telephone: (612) 331-1464

Facsimile: (612) 331-2239